

Exhibit 10

CISLO & THOMAS LLP

Attorneys at Law

A PARTNERSHIP INCLUDING A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION

SUITE 900

233 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD

SANTA MONICA, CALIFORNIA 90401

(310) 451-0647

L. A. (323) 870-1163

FACSIMILE (310) 394-4477

INTERNET WWW.CISLO.COM

PROCUREMENT AND ENFORCEMENT
OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY

PATENT, TRADEMARK
COPYRIGHT & RELATED MATTERS

June 1, 2005

VIA TELECOPIER ONLY

TRANSMISSION FAX NUMBER: (617) 345-4745

TOTAL PAGES: 2

John T. Gutkoski, Esq.,
Day, Berry & Howard LLP
260 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110

Re: Sensitech Inc. et al. v. Time & Temperature Company
Civil Action No. 04-11483 MLW
U.S. District Court – District of Massachusetts
Our Docket No. 04-13777

Dear John:

We are writing in response to your letter of May 27, 2005 (received in our office on May 31, 2005). In our view, the model complaint of Form 16 contemplates suits involving a single plaintiff and a single defendant manufacturing a single product. In such a case, a Form 16 complaint comports with Rule 8 because there is no doubt as to the identity of the allegedly infringing product. However, in cases where a defendant manufactures numerous products, a factual situation not contemplated by Form 16, a bare bones complaint while it may follow the format of Form 16 does not comply with the requirements of Rule 8 because it fails to identify which of the defendant's numerous products are alleged to be infringing. Moreover, the drafters of Form 16 did not contemplate cases where the plaintiff would use the judicial process as a weapon to harm the business of a competitor.

In the instant case, TNT manufactures numerous temperature recording devices and Sensitech's complaint fails to identify even a single allegedly infringing product. Moreover, Sensitech's past actions towards TNT provide reasonable grounds for TNT's belief that the instant lawsuit lacks merit and has been brought for the sole purpose of harming TNT's business. Given the factual background, TNT believes that more than a mere naked allegation of infringement is required to comport with Rule 8. Specifically, Sensitech should identify the products it alleges to infringe its patents and should provide some factual basis for its claims.

This message is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed, and may contain information that is privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible for delivering the message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by telephone and return the original message to us at the above address via the U.S. Postal Service. Thank you.

CISLO & THOMAS LLP

Attorneys at Law

John Gutkoski, Esq.

June 1, 2005

Page 2

In view of Sensitech's unwillingness to amend its complaint to provide the very minimal information requested above, TNT will proceed with its planned motion to dismiss or in the alternative seek a more definite statement. TNT's motion is not an attempt to obtain "free discovery" as you allege, rather it is simply an attempt to obtain an understanding of the claims alleged and the factual basis for the same.

If you have any questions or comments, please feel free to contact me.

Very truly yours,

CISLO & THOMAS LLP



Daniel M. Cislo